DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 126 CG 020 255

AUTHOR Fagan, Ronald W.; And Others
TITLE Reasons for Alcohol Use in Maritally Violent Men.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (67th, Long Beach, CA, April 23-26, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; Battered Women; *Drinking; *Family Violence; Interpersonal Relationship; *Males; Marital Satisfaction; *Spouses

ABSTRACT

Alcohol consumption is often associated with aggressive behaviors. This study compared the contexts and reasons for drinking of maritally violent men (N=44) and three maritally nonviolent comparison groups: happily married men (N=54), unhappily married men (N=41), and men who had been convicted of a violent offense, but who did not beat their wives (N=33). Subjects completed measures of marital violence, marital satisfaction, sociodemographic status, drinking quantity and frequency, parents' drinking, drinking context, reasons for drinking, and alcohol and violence. Compared to the nonviolence groups, the maritally violent group reported higher levels of alcohol consumption in all drinking context items. While significant differences were found, the mean level of consumption in all contexts was relatively low. Maritally violent men reported drinking to forget worries, pains, and stresses in their lives more so than did nonviolent men. At least one-half of the maritally violent men reported that drinking accompanied abusive events at least occasionally, while about one-third reported it often accompanied their abuse. These findings suggest that, while alcohol use may facilitate marital violence, alcohol use and mental abuse may be symptoms of other factors. Therapy should focus on the underlying causes of both the alcohol use and the spouse abuse. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287126

Reasons for Alcohol Use in Maritally Violent Men

CG 020255

Ronald W. Fagan
Ola W. Barnett
John B. Patton
Social Science Division
Pepperdine University
Malibu, CA 90265

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald W. Fagan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The study compared the contexts and reasons for drinking of a maritally violent group as compared to three non-violent comparison groups. We found that the maritally violent group reported higher levels of alcohol consumption in all of the drinking context items with the most significant differences being on drinking at home after work, at home while playing with the kids, at recreational activities, at home by oneself, on the job, at workday lunch, and with people after work. While we did find significant differences, the mean level of consumption in all contexts was relatively low. We found that the maritally violent men tended to drink to forget worries, pains, and stresses in their lives more so than the nonviolent groups. At least half of the maritally violent men reported that drinking accompanied abusive events at least occasionally, while about one-third reported it often or very often accompanied their abuse. We conclude that while our findings indicate that alcohol use may facilitate marital violence, our findings also suggest that alcohol use and the mental abuse may be symptoms of other individual, structural, or cultural norm factors. Therapy should not focus exclusively on the alcohol use, but on the underlying causes of both the alcohol use and the spouse abuse.

Studies suggest that at least 30% of married women in the United States have been victims of physical abuse (Straus, 1978). The consumption of alcohol is frequently seen as associated with a wide range of aggressive behaviors including domestic violence (Pernanen, 1976, 1981). It is estimated that alcohol is present in between 20% to 80% of various types of crime situations (Collins, 1981). Studies also show some relationship between alcohol use by the victim and alcohol use by the assailant (Mayfield, 1976; Virkkunen, 1974).

It is estimated that between 6% to 85% of the spouse abuse cases involve the use of alcohol (Coleman and Straus, 1983; Van Hasselt et al., 1985; Kantor and Straus, 1986; Gerson, 1978; Rosenbaum and O'Leary, 1981). But there is also contradictory data on the association between alcohol use and marital violence (Bard and Zacker, 1974; Star, 1978). In addition, it should be noted that high rates of alcohol use and abuse also characterize the general population (Cahalan, 1970).

But stating that alcohol use is associated with high rates of family violence does not explain the exact nature of the relationship. Alcohol use and abuse may cause the family violence or the marital and family problems may precede the alcohol use. It may be that the alcohol use is a conditional factor in an interactive process between drinking by one or more family members and preexisting family problems. It is also possible that the use of alcohol in violent situations is merely coincidental.

Conclusions about the relationship are further complicated by methodological problems associated with many of the studies. Among the most significant methodological weaknesses are that many of the studies do not utilize comparison or control groups, biased samples, nonuniform measures of

alcohol use and aggressive behavior, and failure to delineate the conditions under which alcohol use and abuse occur (Greenberg, 1981; Pernanen, 1976).

Four basic theories have been postulated to explain the relationship between alcohol use and aggressive behavior: deviance disavowal, disinhibition, social learning, and interaction.

Deviance disavowal theory states that drunkenness provides a "time-out" period when the drinker is not held fully responsible for his behavior (MacAndrew and Edgerton, 1969). Their behavior while drunk is not attributable to their personal or social characteristics, but "explained" or "excused" by the effects of alcohol. As Gelles (1974:117) notes: "Individuals who wish to carry out a violent act become intoxicated in order to carry out the violent act." There is much support in the literature for deviance disavowal. Many abusers and their victims blame the behavior on drinking by the abuser (Coleman and Straus, 1983; Gelles, 1974; Richardson and Campbell, 1980; McCaghy, 1968).

Social learning theory postulates that people learn to expect to behave more aggressively when drinking and therefore do so, even if the alcohol itself has no direct disinhibitory effect on their behavior. What is important is the social meaning that is attached to drinking alcohol and learned by the individual in a social and cultural context (Brown et al., 1980; Donovan and Marlatt, 1980; Berg et al., 1981; Coleman and Straus, 1983). There is much research to support the social learning perspective, especially the finding that many drinkers learn to associate alcohol use with aggressiveness and disinhibition of antisocial impulses (Room, 1980; Crawford, 1984; Russell and Mehrabian, 1973). But some research shows that more experienced drinkers learn to refine and limit their expectancies to more concrete factors (Brown et al., 1980).

Disinhibition theory states that the chemical properties of alcohol

directly effect the central nervous system by reducing inhibitions thus freeing people to express their underlying aggressive impulses. This theory has wide support by the general public. Alcohol thus facilitates aggressive expression by reducing fear and anxiety and diminishing the perceived impact of physical and social consciences of aggression (Zeichner and Pihl, 1979; Taylor et al., 1976; Schmittee et al., 1979; Marlatt et al., 1975; Pearlin and Rodabaugh, 1974; Miller et al., 1974). Most contemporary evidence does not support this theory (Pernanen, 1976). Alcohol may serve as a generalized physiological activity mechanism, but by itself it does not disinhibit. It is only when the physiological effects of alcohol interact with individual expectancies and the social environment (Sher, 1985). Research has found that violence tends to be lessened among those who are most inebriated (Steinglass, 1977; Coleman and Straus, 1983).

Finally, the last category we have called interactive theory. This group of studies focuses on the interactive relationship between drinking and violence within the family. Discussions about a husband's drinking and associative behavior escalate into arguments about other aspects of the relationship which culminate in violent behavior (Pernanen, 1976, 1981; Kaufman, 1985). The empirical evidence has yielded conflicting results as to the exact nature of the role of alcohol in family disputes (Billings et al., 1979; Leonard, 1984; Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Research by Kantor and Straus (1986) indicates the combination of lower occupational status, drinking, and belief in violence was associated with the highest rate of wife abuse in their study. But they also point out that at least two-thirds of blue-collar husbands who approved of violence and drink do not assault their wives during the year before their study.

The purpose of this study is to further explore the relationship between drinking and family abuse. While the study utilizes a traditional measure

of alcoholism (a modified quantity-frequency index), the focus of the study is on the situations or contexts where drinking occurs (both within and outside the partner's relationship) and the reasons why the partners drink and engage in abusive episodes. We compared an abusive group with three nonabusive comparison groups.

Methodology

Subjects were paid to participate in the study. We used one experimental group of maritally violent men (MV, N=44) and three control groups of maritally nonviolent males: happily married or satisfied men (MNV-S, N=54); unhappily married, discordant men (MNV-D, N=41); men who had been convicted of a violent offense, but who did not beat their wives (MNV-VO, N=33).

Level of marital violence was assessed by subject responses to the violence subsection of the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ)(Barnett, 1985). The RAQ is a modified version of the Conflicts Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). Men who admitted to several forms of physical violence committed at a low rate (e.g., "more than once during the relationship") or who admitted to one form of physical violence committed at a high level (e.g., "2-5 times a year") were categorized as maritally violent.[1] Additionally, court-ordered males enrolled in a psychotherapy program were classified as maritally violent regardless of their answers on the RAQ. Twenty-five of the men judged maritally violent were untreated men in the community who had not come into contact with the judicial system because of their abuse. Nineteen of the men were court-identified abuser volunteers recruited at the beginning of their court-ordered psychotherapy.

Subjects' level of marital satisfaction was evaluated by their responses to the Locke-Wallace Marital Satisfaction Test (SMAT)(Locke and Wallace,

1959). Men whose scores were 89 or below were categorized as maritally discordant. Men with scores of 90 or above were classified as satisfactorily married.

Sociodemographic Comparison

The experimenters attempted to match the subjects on significant sociodemographic variables. As Table 1 indicates, we were not entirely successful because the MNV-VO participants were primarily young, cohabiting males of minority status who were unemployed and undereducated.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 1 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Furthermore, the MV males tended to be young, somewhat undereducated, and very likely to have difficulties holding a job. There was no significant differences between the four populations on age, education, number of children at home, times married, degree of religiosity, and whether the male partner was married to a younger woman, and length of marriage.

A Chi Square Analysis revealed a significant difference ($\underline{X}^2[15,N=172)]=28.82$; $p<.05$) in the racial composition of the groups. The major difference occurred because the men in the MNV-VO group were less likely to be White (36%) as compared to the other three groups which were twice that percentage (MV-61%, MNV-D-67%, MNV-S-66%). At least twice (50%) as many of the MNV-VO group were Black (MV-16%, MNV-D-19%, MNV-S-23%).

An ANOVA of income ($\underline{F}[3,166]=6.66$; $p<.001$) and employment status ($\underline{F}[3,167]=7.66$; $p<.0001$) indicated significant differences between the MNV-VO group and each of the other three groups. Nine of the 33 men in the MNV-VO group were in prison with no income. A number of the probationers in the

community had no employment as well.

There was significant differences between the groups in length of relationship ($F[3,167]=6.10$; $p<.001$). Both the MNV-S and the MNV-D groups differed significantly from the MV and MNV-VO groups as shown by a Student-Newman-Keuls Range Test. We also found significant differences ($X^2[12,N=167]=41.43$, $p<.0001$) between the group on marital status. The primary reason is the low percentage of MNV-VO married males (17%) as compared to the other groups (MV-43%, MNV-D-57%, MNV-S-66%).[3]

Drinking Measures Quantity-Frequency Index

Studies have used a number of different measures of drinking. The two most common measures are the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (MAST)(Selzer, 1971) and the Quantity-Frequency Index (QFI)(Cahalan et al., 1969). Studies using the MAST generally show higher scores for violent versus non-violent men (Van Hasselt et al., 1985; Rosenbaum and O'Leary, 1981). Studies utilizing the QFI (or a variation) report inconsistent findings. Van Hasselt and Associates (1985) found no significant differences between violent and non-violent men. Kantor and Straus (1986) found that husband's drinking was positively related to wife abuse. Among men who approved of "slapping a wife," wife abuse was highest for "high moderate" drinking, declined for the "high" category, but rose again for "binge" drinkers (also see Coleman and Straus, 1983).

We used a modified version of the QFI. We used the standard frequency index (ten-point range from "never" drink, respectively, wine, beer, whiskey to "3 or more times a day"). Due to questionnaire restrictions, we modified the quantity index such that for each type of alcoholic beverage, respondents were to indicate quantity on a 13-point scale (from "never" to "5 or 6 glasses nearly every time").

While we found no significant differences between the four populations on the QFI, we did find that the MV group consistently had higher quantity-frequency rates. When we focused on quantity and frequency separately, we found significant differences ($F[3,141]=4.28$; $p<.01$) between the MNV-S group ($M=3.21$) and the other three groups (MNV-D, $M=4.89$; MNV-VO, $M=5.50$; MV, $M=5.92$) on the amount of beer consumed. We also found significant differences ($F[3,110]=3.00$; $p<.05$) between the MV group ($M=4.88$) and the MNV-S group (2.61) in the amount of whiskey consumed (the MNV-D, $M=3.19$ and the MNV-VO, $M=4.05$).

If we focus on the heavy drinkers (defined as persons drinking at least twice a day), we find that one-quarter (25%) of the MV group as compared to 12% of the MNV-D, 16% of the MNV-VO, and 7.8% of the MNV-S groups drink beer at this level. For the drinking of whiskey and wine there were not great differences between the groups.

Parent's Drinking

We found no significant differences between the MV group and the comparison groups on their father's and mother's drinking. Table 2 presents the percentage responses to the question: "How frequently, on average, did your father/stepfather (father figure) drink any alcoholic beverages: wine, beer, or whiskey." The next question asked about their mother.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 2 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

About one-third of the MV and the MNV-D group's fathers drink at least once a day as compared to about one-fourth of the MNV-VO and MNV-S groups. About twice as many of the MV and MNV-D group's fathers drink at least three

times a day as compared to the MNV-VO and MNV-S groups.

Drinking Context

We asked the respondents a series of questions about where their drinking usually took place.[4]

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 3 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

As Table 3 indicates, we found a number of significant differences between the MV group and at least one of the comparison populations. The only question that we did not find significant differences was on the items: "drank at a restaurant or bar," "drank at a party at your house or someone else's," and "drank when friends came over to your house or you visited" (the latter two items were very close to $p<.05$ level of significance). The item with the most significant difference was "drank at home any time after work (including mealtime). The MV group drank significantly more frequently at home than the comparison groups. While on all of the items the MV group had higher frequency rates than any of the comparison groups, the overall mean level of consumption for all the groups was relatively low. With the exception of drinking at home after work ($\underline{M}=4.15$ with 4="1-2 times a week"), most of the mean responses were between "less than once a month" (2) and "1-3 times a month" (3).

We also asked the men to estimate their female partner's context for drinking (see Table 4). The MV group consistently reported higher levels of

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 4 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

alcohol consumption for their female partners in all contexts. The mean level of consumption was consistently lower than their reported mean level of consumption. With the exception of drinking at home after work (M=3.21), the mean responses for all the groups were all less than "1-3 times per month." The most significant difference was "drank at lunch on workday" (though the frequency for all the groups was less than once a month).

While space limitations preclude a complete examination of the percentage responses of the drinking context items, a selected discussion will illuminate some patterns of drinking for the maritally violent male group. Almost one-quarter (17.5%) of the MV group as compared to usually less than one-twentieth of the other groups (MNV-D-5.4%, MNV-VO-3.4%, MNV-S-3.9%) drank at lunch one workday at least 4-6 times a week. About one-third (31.2%) of the MV group as compared to less than 15% (MNV-D-14.9%, MNV-VO-4.3%, MNV-S-11.8%) of the other groups drank at home at least 4-6 times a week while spending time with their kids. Almost half (46.3% of the MV group as compared to 30% of the MNV-D and about 10% (MNV-VO-10.3%; MNV-S-11.8%) of the other groups drank at least 4-6 times a week at home after work. Finally, over one-quarter (27.3%) of the MV group as compared to about one-fifth (21.5%) of the MNV-D group and about one-tenth (MNV-VO-10.7%, MNV-S-8%) of the other groups drank at least 4-6 times a week when they were home alone.[5]

Reasons for Drinking

Respondents were presented with a series of items asking them to evaluate their reasons (and their female partner's reasons) for drinking (see Table 5). The response categories were "not at all important" (1), "fairly important" (2), and "very important" (3).[6] Only one item, "drank to celebrate special occasions," on average was rated at least "fairly important" by all four groups.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 5 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

We did find significant differences between the MV group and at least one of the comparison groups on the items: "drank to help yourself forget your worries," "drank when you wanted to forget everything," "drank to celebrate special occasions," "drank because it deadened the pain in your life," "a drink helped to cheer you up when you were in a bad mood," and "drank because you needed it when tense and nervous."

A look at the percentage responses further illuminates the relationships (space requirements limit a full presentation of these findings). At least twice as many of the MV group (34.2%) as compared to the other groups (MNV-D-17.2%, MNV-VO-7.7%, MNV-S-11.4%) said drinking to deaden pain in life was "very important." About one-third of the MV (31.6%) and MNV-VO (32.3%) groups as compared to less than one-half that amount (MNV-VO-12%, MNV-S-6.5%) for the other groups said drinking to forget worries was "very important." About twice as many of the MV group (25%) as compared to the other groups (MNV-D-13.9%, MNV-VO-9.7%, MNV-S-8.3%) said drinking to relax was "very important."[7]

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 6 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The MV respondent's evaluations of their female partner's reasons for drinking were very similar to their own reasons with drinking to celebrate receiving the highest mean score ($\underline{M}$=2.21) followed by drinking to be sociable ($\underline{M}$=1.97) (See Table 6). Drinking to celebrate was also rated the highest by

the three comparison groups. We found significant differences between the MV group and at least one of the comparison groups on "drank to be sociable," "drank to celebrate special occasions," "a drink helped to cheer you up when you were in a bad mood," and "drank because it deadened the pain in your life."

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 6 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

We categorized the reasons for drinking items into two groupings: "Drink to be Sociable" and "Drink to Forget Worries."[8] We found no significant differences between the MV and the comparison groups on "Drink to be Sociable" scale for the males. For the male's evaluations of their female partners, we found a significant difference ($F[3,116]=3.24$; $p<.05$) between the MV group ($\underline{M}=7.63$, SD 2.06) and the MNV-D ($\underline{M}=6.59$, SD=1.70), MNV-VO ($\underline{M}=6.17$, SD=1.80), and the MNV-S ($\underline{M}=6.39$, SD=2.17) groups on this scale. For the men, we found a significant difference ($F[3,123]=4.65$, $p<.01$) between the MV group ($\underline{M}=11.36$, SD=4.45) and the MNV-S group ($\underline{M}=8.27$, SD=3.10) in the "Drink to Forget Worries" scale.

Alcohol and Violence

As we previously discussed, because alcohol use is prevalent in a relationship does not necessarily mean that it occurred regularly during the abusive events or it is a causal factor. To further elaborate the relationship, we asked the respondents to indicate the frequency with which they and their female partner were drinking during abusive events. Table 7 shows the percentage responses for the maritally violent (MV) group.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Table 7 about here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

About one-third (31%) of the respondents indicated that their drinking accompanied abusive events "often" or "very often." An additional one-fourth (26.2%) said it was "occasionally" associated with abusive events. About one-fourth (23.6%) of the MV group said their female partner was "often" or "very often" drinking during abusive events.

The male respondents were asked a series of questions about the consequences of violence for themselves and their partner.[9] The third most frequently mentioned category (after "felt sexy/wanted to make love" and "you tried to stop the abuse through reasoning") was "took drugs/had a drink." There was a significant difference ($F[3,144]=8.96$, $p<.001$) between the MV groups and the three comparison groups on this variable. The mean value for the MV group was about "2-5 times a year" whereas for the MNV-D group the mean value was "once a year," for the MNV-VO group the mean value was about "more than once in the relationship," and for the MNV-S the mean value was "once in the relationship."[10]

Conclusions

The focus of our study was on the contexts and reasons for drinking among a maritally violent group as compared to three non-violent comparison groups. We found that while the overall quantity-frequency index did not yield significant differences between the groups, the maritally violent group did report significantly higher levels of beer and whiskey consumption.

We found that the maritally violent group reported higher levels of alcohol consumption in all of the drinking context items. The most

significant difference between the maritally violent and non-violent comparison groups was on drinking at home after work, but we also found significant differences in drinking at home while playing with the kids, at recreational activities, at home by yourself, on the job, at workday lunch, and with people after work. While we did find significant differences, the mean level of consumption in all contexts was relatively low (though we did find some comparatively high levels of consumption for the maritally violent group in what could be called negative contexts - drinking at workday lunch, at home alone, and while playing with the kids). We also found that in most contexts, the maritally violent men reported higher frequencies than the non-violent groups in terms of consumption by their female partners.

In terms of reasons for drinking, we found the maritally violent group tended to drink to forget the worries, pains, and stresses in their lives more so than the nonviolent groups. The maritally violent group's evaluation of their female partner's reasons for drinking were a combination of social and emotional reasons.

At least half of the maritally violent men reported that drinking accompanied abusive events at least occasionally, while about one-third reported it often or very often accompanied their abuse. About one-fourth of the maritally violent group said their female partner was often or very often drinking during abusive events. It is also interesting to note that one of the frequently mentioned consequences of abuse for the maritally violent men was having a drink or taking drugs.

Hotaling and Sugarman (1986), in a review of 52 case-comparison studies, found that alcohol use by the male abuser was a consistent risk marker of violence (7 out of 9 studies), while alcohol use by the female victim of abuse was not a consistent factor. Consistent with the findings of previous research, we found that alcohol use was <u>associated</u> with marital violence.

But our study also found that the overall rates of alcohol consumption for the maritally violent men was relatively moderate and the reported frequency of drinking during abusive events was also moderate. This was also true for the men's female partner. We also found that drinking was a frequent consequence of an abuse event. Therefore, we cannot say that alcohol use causes marital violence. We can say that it is certainly a facilitating factor. In addition, we cannot say with certainty that our data lend support for one of the traditional theories explaining the relationships between alcohol use and domestic violence.

Our research does point to context and reason for drinking as possible key components of any explanation. Drinking in all contexts was more characteristic of the maritally violent group. The maritally violent group tended to drink to forget the pain in their lives. While alcohol use may facilitate marital violence, our findings would also suggest that the alcohol use and the abuse may be symptoms of other individual, structural, or cultural norm factors. In fact, the literature on the causes of alcoholism and the literature on the causes of marital abuse are remarkably similar.

Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) conclude from their review that the psychiatric perspective offers the best diagnostic and treatment model focusing on childhood experiences, cross-situational violence, and adult adjustment problems. Kantor and Straus (1986) note we also need to focus on the underlying societal factors and cultural traditions. Focusing on alcoholism treatment for marital abuser may be shortsighted. In fact, research has found that the most serious alcohol abusers have lower rates of violence than more moderate users (Kantor and Straus, 1986; Coleman and Straus, 1983). Such therapy should focus on the underlying causes of both the alcohol use and the spouse abuse. But we should note just as there are subtypes of abusers there are subtypes of alcoholics. A multifaceted therapy

approach needs to be based upon an accurate diagnosis of the client's behavior and therapeutic needs.

Footnotes

[1]A computer analysis of the total physical abuse scores revealed that all subjects in the nonviolent groups had a score of 30 or less. There were 15 variables. A score of 2 equaled "once in the relationship."

[2]The religious preference variable was skewed due to the generally high nonresponse rate (from 33% to 86%).

[3]We also had socio-demographic data reported by the male about his female partner. For the MV group the average age was 30, average years of education 13, 49% were White with 12% Black and 20% Hispanic, 26% were employed full-time while 18% were employed most of the time, 45% made $900 or less per month.

[4]The response categories for this series of questions were: "never," "less than once a month," "1-3 times a month," "1-2 times a week," "4-6 times a week," "every day," and "does not apply/don't know." The response categories were coded respectively from 1 to 7 (the "does not apply/don't know" was coded as a missing value).

[5]There were not such significant differences for females on the high frequency of drinking context items.

[6]We also had a response category "does not apply/don't know" coded as a missing value.

[7]We did not find similar responses for the males reporting on their female partners in terms of high frequency of reasons for drinking items. There was not the high degree of percentage differences between the groups.

[8]The "Drink to be Sociable" scale was made up of the following items: "You drank to be sociable," "You drank because the people you know drank," "You drank to celebrate special occasions," and "You drank because it was the polite thing to do in certain situations." The "Drink to Forget Worries" scale was made up of the following items: "You drank because it helped you relax," "You drank when you wanted to forget everything," "You drank to help yourself forget your worries," "A drink helped to cheer you up when you were in a bad mood," "You drank because you needed it when tense and nervous," and "You drank because it deadened the pain in your life."

[9]Response categories were: "never" (1), "once in the relationship" (2), "more than once in relationship" (3), "once a year" (4), "2-5 times a year" (5),

"monthly" (6), "more than once a month" (7), "weekly" (8), "2-5 times a week" (9), "daily" (10), and "does not apply/don't know" (coded as missing value). Evaluated responses were: "You tried to fight back by yelling/screaming/threatening," "You tried to fight back by getting physically violent," "You withdrew (left/refused to speak)," "You got emotionally upset (felt like crying/cried)," "You felt sexy/wanted to make love," "You took drugs/had a drink," "You were able to 'get you own way'," "You tried to stop the abuse through reasoning," "You did nothing (just 'took it')."

[10]We found a significant difference ($F[3,144]=8.96$, $p<.001$) between the MV group and the three comparison groups on this item. The mean value of the men's evaluation of their female partner's response to abuse ranked "took drugs/had a drink" sixth ($\underline{M}=4.28$) out of nine categories.

References

Bard, M. and Zacker, J. (1974). Assaultiveness and alcohol use in family disputes: Police perspectives. Criminology, 12:281-292.

Barnett, O. (1985). Relationship abuse questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University.

Berg, E., Laberg, J., Skutle, A., and Ohman, A. (1981). Instructed versus pharmacological effects of alcohol in alcoholics and social drinkers. Behavioral Research and Therapy, 19:55-66.

Billings, A., Kessler, M., Gomberg, C., and Weiner, S. (1979). Marital conflict resolution of alcoholic and non-alcoholic couples during drinking and nondrinking sessions. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 40:183-195.

Brown, S., Goldman, M., Inn, A., and Anderson, L. (1980). Expectations of reinforcement from alcohol: Their domain and relation to drinking patterns. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48:419-426.

Cahalan, D., Cisin, I., and Crossley, H. (1969). American Drinking Practices: A National Study of Drinking Behavior and Attitudes. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Center for Alcohol Studies.

Cahalan, D. (1970). Problem Drinkers: A national survey. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, D., and Straus, M. (1983). Alcohol abuse and family violence. Pp 104-124 in Alcohol, drug abuse and aggression, Gottheil, E., Druley, K., Skoloda, T., and Waxman, H. (eds.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Collins, J. (1981). Alcohol use and criminal behavior: an empirical theoretical and methodological overview. Pp. 288-316 in Drinking and crime: Perspectives on the relationships between alcohol consumption and criminal behavior, Collins, J. (ed.) New York: Guilford Press.

Dobash, R., and Dobash, R. (1979). Violence against wives: A case against patriarchy. New York: Free Press.

Donovan, and Marlatt, G. (1980). Assessment of expectancies and behaviors associated with alcohol consumption. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 40:1153-1185.

Gelles, R. (1974). The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gerson, L. (1978). Alcohol related acts of violence: Who was drinking and where the acts occurred. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 39:1294-1296.

Greenberg, S. (1981). Alcohol and crime: A methodological critique of the literature. Pp. 362-385 in Drinking and Crime: Perspectives on the relationships between alcohol consumption and criminal behavior, Collins, J. (ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Hotaling, G., and Sugarman, D. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1:101-123.

Kantor, G., and Straus, M. (1986). The drunken bum theory of wife beating. Paper presented at the national alcoholism forum conference on alcohol and the family. San Francisco, CA.

Kaufman, E. (1985). Substance abuse and family therapy. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Locke, H., and Wallace, K. (1959). Short marital adjustment and predictions tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21:251-255.

MacAndrew, C., and Edgerton, R. (1969). Drunken comportment. Chicago: Aldine.

McCaghy, C. (1968). Drinking and deviance disavowal: The case of child molesters. Social Problems, 16:43-49.

Marlatt, G., Kosturn, C., and Lang, A. Provocation to anger and opportunity for retaliation as determinants of alcohol consumption in social drinkers. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 84:652-654.

Mayfield, S. (1976). Alcoholism, alcohol, intoxication and assaultive behavior. Diseases of the Nervous System, 37:288-291.

Miller, P., Herson, M., Eisler, R., and Hilsman, G. Effects of social stress on operant drinking of alcoholics and social drinkers. Behavior Research and Therapy, 12:67-72.

Pearlin, L., and Radabaugh, C. Economic strains and the coping functions of alcohol. American Journal of Sociology, 82:652-663.

Pernanen, K. (1976). Alcohol and crimes of violence. Pp. 351-444 in The biology of alcoholism. Vol 4: Social aspects of alcoholism, Kissen, B., and Beglecter (eds.). New York: Plenum.

Pernanen, K. (1981). Theoretical aspects of the relationship between alcohol use and crime. Pp. 186-203 in Drinking and crime: Perspectives on the relationships between alcohol consumption and criminal behavior, Collins, J. (ed.). New York: Guilford.

Richardson, D., and Campbell, J. (1980). Alcohol and wife abuse: The effect of alcohol on attributions of blame for wife abuse. Personality and Social Psychology, 64:51-56.

Room, R. (1980). Alcohol as an instrument of intimate domination. Paper presented at the society for the study of social problems meetings. New York.

Rosenbaum, A., and O'Leary, D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49:63-71.

Russell, J., and Mehrabian, G. The mediating role of emotions in alcohol use. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 36:1508-1536.

Schmittee, G., Leonard, K., and Taylor, S. (1979). Alcohol and expectations of attack. Psychological Reports, 45:163-167.

Selzer, M. (1971). The Michigan alcoholism screening test: The quest for a new diagnostic instrument. American Journal of Psychiatry, 127:1653-1658.

Sher, J. (1985). Subjective effects of alcohol: The influence of setting and individual differences in alcohol expectancies. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 46:137-146.

Star, B. (1978). Comparing battered and non-battered women. Victimology, 3:32-44.

Steinglass, P., Davis, D., and Berenson, D. (1977). Observations of conjointly hospitalized "alcoholic couples" during sobriety and intoxication: Implications for theory and therapy. Family Process, 16:1-16.

Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41:75-88.

Straus, M. (1977-1978). Wife beating: How common and why? Victimology, 2:443-458.

Taylor, S., Gammon, C., and Capasso, D. (1976). Aggression as a function of the interaction of alcohol and threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34:938-941.

Van Hasselt, Vincent, B., Morrison, R., and Bellock, A. (1985). Alcohol use in wife abusers and their spouses. Addictive Behaviors, 10:127-135.

Virkkunen, M. (1974). Alcohol as a factor precipitating aggression and conflict behavior leading to homicide. British Journal of Addiction, 69:149-154.

Zeichner, A., and Pihl, O. (1979). Effects of alcohol and behavior contingencies on human aggression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 88:153-160.

Table 1
Sociodemographic Variables of Batterers and Control Groups

Sociodemographic Variables	Groups[a] MV	MNV-D	MNV-VO	MNV-S	df	F Ratio	F Prob
Age	30.86	33.63	29.45	32.63	3,168	1.9020	.1312
Education	13.31	13.40	12.36	13.65	3,167	2.4182	.0681
Income[b]	6.43	6.95	4.75	6.73	3,166	6.6581	.0003*
Employment[c]	4.06	4.39	3.59	4.52	3,169	7.6615	.0001**
Length Marriage[d]	3.91	4.63	3.13	4.53	3,165	2.3717	.0723
# Children Home	1.91	2.04	2.32	2.03	3,106	.5314	.6617
Times Married	1.39	1.31	1.25	1.19	3,119	.8411	.4739
Degree Religiosity[e]	4.06	4.15	3.50	3.94	3,78	.1848	.9064
M/Older (Age Diff)[f]	2.20	1.18	1.21	1.52		.3683	.7760

[a]Numbers in columns represent mean values

[b]These mean variables represent a categorical arrangement as follows: (1) = Less than $300, (2) = $300-$600, (3) = $600-$900, (4) = $900-$1200, (5) = $1200-$1500, (6) = $1500-$2000, (7) = $2000-$3000, (8) = above $3000.

[c]These mean variables represent a categorical arrangement as follows: (1) = not at all, (2) = about 1/4 the time, (3) = about half the time, (5) = most of the time, (6) = all of the time.

[d]These mean variables represent a categorical arrangement as follows: (1) = 0-5 yrs., (2) = 5-10 yrs., (3) = 10-15 yrs., (4) = 15-20 yrs., (5) = over 20 yrs.

[e]These mean variables represent a categorical arrangement as follows: (1) = very religious to (7) = not at all religious.

[f]The larger number indicates greater degree of age difference with the male partner being older.

*p<.001
**p<.0001

Table 2
Percentage Responses Parent's Average Drinking (Male)

Question	Responses										
	Never	Less Once Year	Less Once Month	1-2 Times Month	2-3 Times Month	1-2 Times Week	3-4 Times Week	Once a Day	Twice a Day	3+ Times Day	Total
a. Father drinking											
MV	9.8	9.8	12.1	4.9	12.1	9.8	4.9	9.8	7.3	19.5	100.0
MNV-D	18.8	9.4	15.6	9.4	3.1	0	12.5	9.4	3.1	18.8	100.1
MNV-VO	20.0	3.3	16.7	16.7	13.3	3.3	3.3	6.7	6.7	10.0	100.0
MNV-S	19.2	7.7	19.2	3.8	7.7	5.8	13.5	9.6	5.8	7.7	100.0
b. Mother drinking											
MV	26.9	14.7	19.5	4.9	2.4	7.3	12.2	7.3	2.4	2.4	100.0
MNV-D	15.6	21.9	28.1	9.4	3.1	3.1	6.3	6.3	3.1	3.1	100.0
MNV-VO	26.8	10.0	23.3	13.3	3.3	3.3	10.0	0	0	10.0	100.0
MNV-S	34.7	19.3	11.5	11.5	15.4	1.9	0	1.9	1.9	1.9	100.0

Table 3
Analysis of Variance Male Drinking Context

Question		Groups MV	MNV-D	MNV-VO	MNV-S	df	F ratio	F probability
a. Drank workday lunch	M	2.38	1.57	1.76	1.45	3,153	3.88	.0104*
	SD	(1.72)	(1.30)	(1.27)	(1.08)			
b. Drank on job	M	1.65	1.00	1.38	1.24	3,141	3.93	.0099**
	SD	(1.18)	(0.00)	(.94)	(.69)			
c. Drank with people after work	M	2.90	2.44	2.73	2.08	3,158	3.13	.0275*
	SD	(1.51)	(1.39)	(1.55)	(1.11)			
d. Drank at home after work	M	4.15	3.23	2.55	2.73	3,157	7.75	.0001***
	SD	(1.64)	(1.66)	(1.62)	(1.55)			
e. Drank at home while playing with kids	M	3.25	2.46	1.87	2.06	3,111	4.22	.0072**
	SD	(1.90)	(1.56)	(1.39)	(1.54)			
f. Drank at parties	M	3.09	2.75	2.97	2.37	3,160	2.59	.0546
	SD	(1.51)	(1.28)	(1.54)	(1.04)			
g. Drank when friends visit	M	3.24	2.88	2.74	2.43	3,160	2.60	.0542
	SD	(1.56)	(1.30)	(1.50)	(1.27)			
h. Drank at restaurant or bar	M	3.00	2.93	2.90	2.31	3,162	2.29	.0800
	SD	(1.56)	(1.59)	(1.78)	(1.02)			
i. Drank at home by yourself	M	3.30	2.80	2.35	2.28	3,161	4.04	.0084**
	SD	(1.68)	(1.62)	(1.43)	(1.39)			
j. Drank at recreational activities	M	3.25	2.76	2.55	2.24	3,160	4.07	.0081**
	SD	(1.63)	(1.40)	(1.50)	(1.23)			

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.0001

Table 4
Analysis of Variance Female Drinking Context

Question		Groups MV	MNV-D	MNV-VO	MNV-S	df	F ratio	F probability
a. Drank workday lunch	M	1.90	1.24	1.43	1.17	3,129	3.99	.0094**
	SD	(1.27)	(.90)	(1.20)	(.53)			
b. Drank on job	M	1.03	1.09	1.30	1.15	3,129	.98	.4054
	SD	(.18)	(.51)	(1.02)	(.56)			
c. Drank with people after work	M	2.47	2.17	2.17	1.51	3,133	4.46	.0051
	SD	(1.40)	(1.25)	(1.37)	(.83)			
d. Drank at home after work	M	3.21	2.45	2.46	2.22	3,150	3.13	.0276*
	SD	(1.69)	(1.39)	(1.75)	(1.42)			
e. Drank at home while playing with kids	M	2.48	2.17	1.86	1.88	3,103	1.02	.3871
	SD	(1.64)	(1.58)	(1.56)	(1.39)			
f. Drank at parties	M	2.83	2.42	2.86	2.12	3,154	3.07	.0295*
	SD	(1.43)	(1.24)	(1.64)	(.98)			
g. Drank when friends visit	M	2.85	2.38	2.60	2.10	3,157	2.68	.0488*
	SD	(1.44)	(1.18)	(1.63)	(1.06)			
h. Drank at restaurant or bar	M	2.71	2.35	2.54	2.15	3,157	1.33	.2657
	SD	(1.47)	(1.12)	(1.99)	(1.06)			
i. Drank at home by yourself	M	2.49	2.06	2.24	1.70	3,138	2.37	.0730
	SD	(1.35)	(1.41)	(1.76)	(1.05)			
j. Drank at recreational activities	M	2.81	2.36	2.37	1.98	3,150	2.71	.0474*
	SD	(1.52)	(1.36)	(1.62)	(1.16)			

*p<.05
**p<.01

Table 5
Analysis of Variance Male Reason for Drinking

Question		Groups MV	MNV-D	MNV-VO	MNV-S	df	F ratio	F probability
a. Drank to relax	M	1.80	1.72	1.52	1.58	3,151	1.21	.3094
	SD	(.82)	(.70)	(.68)	(.65)			
b. Drank to be sociable	M	1.80	1.71	1.65	1.67	3,151	.38	.7695
	SD	(.69)	(.62)	(.71)	(.69)			
c. Drank because friends drink	M	1.37	1.44	1.41	1.36	3,142	.14	.9342
	SD	(.54)	(.61)	(.73)	(.68)			
d. Drank to forget everything	M	1.76	1.74	1.40	1.24	3,136	4.23	.0068**
	SD	(.91)	(.93)	(.71)	(.57)			
e. Drank to celebrate special occasions	M	2.36	2.19	1.90	2.02	3,154	3.45	.0180*
	SD	(.66)	(.62)	(.71)	(.65)			
f. Drank to forget worries	M	1.78	1.77	1.44	1.25	3,138	4.44	.0052**
	SD	(.88)	(.86)	(.75)	(.58)			
g. Drank because polite to do	M	1.51	1.47	1.41	1.61	3,142	.61	.6097
	SD	(.68)	(.62)	(.57)	(.68)			
h. Drank to cheer you up	M	1.92	1.67	1.82	1.43	3,139	3.04	.0312*
	SD	(.84)	(.74)	(.82)	(.69)			
i. Drank when tense and nervous	M	1.80	1.79	1.69	1.38	3,140	2.86	.0391*
	SD	(.82)	(.70)	(.84)	(.68)			
j. Drank to deaden pain in life	M	1.79	1.52	1.27	1.30	3,133	3.61	.0152*
	SD	(.93)	(.78)	(.60)	(.67)			

*p<.05
**p<.01

Table 6
Analysis of Variance Female Reason for Drinking

Question		Groups MV	MNV-D	MNV-VO	MNV-S	df	F ratio	F probability
a. Drank to relax	M	1.66	1.53	1.41	1.38	3,131	1.43	.2360
	SD	(.71)	(.63)	(.64)	(.63)			
b. Drank to be sociable	M	1.97	1.68	1.56	1.51	3,132	3.44	.0187*
	SD	(.73)	(.60)	(.70)	(.68)			
c. Drank because friends drink	M	1.59	1.39	1.27	1.31	3,123	1.60	.1917
	SD	(.70)	(.56)	(.67)	(.62)			
d. Drank to forget everything	M	1.56	1.31	1.22	1.22	3,118	2.20	.0913
	SD	(.73)	(.62)	(.52)	(.58)			
e. Drank to celebrate special occasions	M	2.21	1.94	1.79	1.89	3,143	2.74	.0458*
	SD	(.68)	(.61)	(.69)	(.72)			
f. Drank to forget worries	M	1.57	1.43	1.29	1.22	3,116	1.90	.1334
	SD	(.77)	(.66)	(.55)	(.59)			
g. Drank because polite to do	M	1.46	1.55	1.42	1.42	3,126	.27	.8454
	SD	(.65)	(.63)	(.58)	(.68)			
h. Drank to cheer you up	M	1.74	1.55	1.73	1.32	3,124	2.74	.0464*
	SD	(.74)	(.63)	(.83)	(.66)			
i. Drank when tense and nervous	M	1.63	1.75	1.50	1.39	3,121	1.45	.2308
	SD	(.73)	(.70)	(.76)	(.73)			
j. Drank to deaden pain in life	M	1.63	1.24	1.23	1.25	3,118	2.83	.0415*
	SD	(.84)	(.52)	(.51)	(.65)			

*p<.05

Table 7
Percentage Responses of MV Drinking During Abusive Events

Question	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Often	Very Often	Total
a. Male was drinking during abusive events	11.9	31.0	26.2	16.7	14.2	100.0
b. Female was drinking during abusive events	21.1	31.6	23.7	13.2	10.4	100.0